



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## MASSACHUSETTS COMMISSION ON MILITARY EDUCATION

---

The legislature of Massachusetts appointed a special commission to report on the practicability of providing military training for boys, and of creating a militia reserve. It consisted of: Robert L. Raymond, *Chairman*, lawyer; Walton A. Green, *Secretary*, editor and publisher of *Boston Journal*; Rev. Charles W. Lyons, S.J., president of Boston College; Alexander Meiklejohn, president of Amherst College; J. Frank O'Hare, secretary of Boston Printing Pressmen's Union; William A. Pew, Major-General, M.V.M., retired; William Stopford, Major-General, M.V.M., retired; John J. Sullivan, Brigadier-General, M.V.M., retired; Harold W. Sweet, manufacturer, mayor of Attleboro.

The first two points to be reported on were: (1) The practicability of providing military education for boys between the ages of fourteen and twenty-one for the purpose of securing a proper military training and discipline for the youths of this commonwealth, and for improving their physical, moral, and mental qualities, and providing for the commonwealth an adequate basis for a citizen soldiery; (2) the practicability of providing military training for youths in the public high schools.

By special arrangement with the secretary, the *School Review* is granted permission to reprint portions of the report of this commission.

### MILITARY TRAINING IN THE SCHOOLS

"Military training" in the schools, as the words are used by different persons, may mean one or more of several things.

First, military drill, in the sense of training with a musket, manual of arms and close order formation. In a word, an imitation of the sort of training which a young man receives at the armory when he goes into the militia.

Second, physical exercises and physical training which will develop not only the body but the attention and mind of the boy receiving it.

Third, the teaching of true military history, personal hygiene, and camp sanitation.

Fourth, the teaching of love of country and willingness to serve it.

The overwhelming weight of opinion from school teachers, military experts, officers of both the regular army and the militia, and the general public is against military drill as defined in the first clause above. It is generally agreed that the military drill which a boy receives in school is of little or no advantage to him from the point of view of practical soldiering. As far as available evidence goes, drill in the schools has had no beneficial effect in promoting enlistments in the militia except in a few isolated localities. For various reasons, it has seemed to create a dislike for soldiering. Military drill in the schools is objected to by many on the ground that boys of school age have not attained sufficient mental maturity to appreciate what war and fighting mean, and are therefore unable to digest ideas which military drill presents to them in concrete form. It is worth noting that military drill as such is given in the schools of no countries of the world except Australia and Japan.

The Commission does not recommend military drill in the schools but is opposed to it.

Physical training which tends to make a boy strong, physically well set up and mentally alert is the proper preparation for the real intensive training necessary to make a soldier, as it is also the proper preparation for civil life. The overwhelming weight of public opinion favors the greater development of physical training in the schools and the standardization and inspection of such training by some central authority.

The Commission recommends the adoption of a systematic plan of physical training in the schools and has drafted legislation providing for that purpose. It believes that the basis of such training should be the system of calisthenics used for many years at West Point under the supervision of Captain Herman J. Koehler, not because that system is particularly military, but because, according to the consensus of expert opinion, it is the best system which can now be adopted.

The Commission also recommends the teaching of personal hygiene, camp sanitation, and the truth about our military history, in the schools.

The Commission also recommends the establishment of training camps for school boys during one month of the summers preceding or following their last year in high or Latin schools. Attendance at such camps should be voluntary and they should be conducted under the joint supervision of the State Board of Education and the Adjutant-General.

The teaching of patriotism or love of country in the schools is something which can hardly be standardized or provided for by legislation. Nevertheless, the Commission feels warranted in expressing the hope that teachers throughout the Commonwealth will feel that it is their duty to inculcate these ideals in the minds of the boys under their charge as a real part of the school life.

The most frequent criticism as to American boys is that they seem to lack a sense of responsibility or of loyalty and duty to something beyond themselves. A spirit of devotion to his country is the finest spirit which a boy can acquire.

That spirit is not at all incompatible with the teaching that every endeavor must be made to maintain peace. The militaristic spirit which means blind faith in the doctrine of force is perhaps the most vicious idea which could be instilled in a boy's mind. The military spirit which means a willingness to serve and fight for his country in time of need, which recognizes as abhorrent the point of view which relies on others to perform the service and do the fighting, is a fine and unselfish sentiment which can not be too early instilled into the youthful mind.

There is no need to use the word "military" in this connection. It is offensive to many, and unquestionably means very different things to different people. What the boy should be taught is that nothing can ever make other than glorious and holy the death of one who dies for his country, and that no boy can shift to the shoulders of others a duty to the nation any more than he can a duty to his family or friends.

CHARLES W. ELIOT, PRESIDENT EMERITUS OF HARVARD UNIVERSITY

Military training in the public schools relates usually to the least interesting and least valuable side of a soldier's preparation. The training in the schools should be devoted to methods which are absolutely sound in regard to the equalization of skill as well as the equalization of bodily condition. If we use such exercises in our schools, systematically and in all schools, we would give the boy the best preparation he could receive at that time of life for a soldier's future and it would also give the boys the best preparation the schools can give for service in the industrial army. And the industrial army is just as important for success in war as the army that fights.

I have heard a great deal of talk lately about the importance of a boy's acquiring the habit of implicit obedience: that is the worst habit a boy can acquire after he ceases to be an infant, because it implies the subjection of the boy's own will.

The worst maxim that has ever been used in education is "Break the child's will." The soldier's discipline, as it has been understood in despotic governments of the Orient and of Europe today begins with the breaking of will, the subjection of every man to his superior officer instinctively—on the spot. That is not a good way to train republicans. What we want in the form of discipline in the army is just what we want in industries; it is the co-operative work; it is the sense of comradeship, fellowship, which in sports we call "team-play." That is the discipline a Republic ought to give its children. And the military discipline that has come down to us is something quite different and very inferior for the purpose of educating and training effective human beings.

The military form of discipline is not individualistic enough for the teacher or for the Republican statesman.

I am a believer in the voluntary system of enlistment and, therefore, a voluntary system in training for war and also for peace purposes. I believe

that superior efficiency can be obtained under the voluntary system, both in fighting and in industries.

It seems to me there is a very great objection to interfering with the personal liberty of the American citizen. It is because of the personal liberty of the American citizen that this Republic exists.

The chance that we should be called upon to defend this country against European or Oriental attack may fairly be called infinitesimal; and yet when we see what the consequences of successful invasion are under the present barbarous methods of conducting warfare, I think we are justified in putting out insurance money in this respect.

I notice some European countries pay men a portion of what they would earn if they went on in the industries in which they are already interested. That is something the State of Massachusetts could do.

Q. What is your opinion of using the militia in strike and riot duty?

A. I suppose that is a very unwilling duty to the militia, but I think it should be used to keep peace.

Q. I did not mean without a substitute—but rather as to the efficacy of the militia for what is more of a police duty. Do you consider the militia equipped by training now for such duty? A. Not nearly so well as the regular army.

Q. Or so well as a constabulary? A. Not so well, certainly, because the regular army and the constabulary in Pennsylvania are all the time in service and enlisted for every day in the year: of course they are much superior.

GEORGE NASMYTH, ESQ., DIRECTOR OF THE WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION

We are all in favor of a reasonable preparedness against war and because we desire that this preparedness shall be adequate, we must protest against the adoption of futile or obsolete methods which experience has shown are likely to defeat the object we have in view. America should make preparations against war which will be really effective, such as the formation of a League to Enforce Peace, the building of submarines and the strengthening of coast fortifications, the abandonment of useless army posts, originally erected to protect the settlers in the west against Indians, and the concentration of the military forces which this would release in larger mobile units in connection with the coast fortifications.

On the other hand, the measures proposed in the resolution authorizing the appointment of this board are futile to achieve the end desired and dangerous because they tend in the opposite direction.

The proposed military training of all boys, while useless from the point of view of real preparedness against war, constitutes a real danger because of its effect in militarizing the minds of the coming generation. The object of the United States at present is to get preparedness without militarism, and the proposed measures are designed to defeat this object.

Military education of high school boys between the ages of fourteen and twenty-one is designed to increase militarism in America and is a step toward preparation for war and not against war. I oppose it therefore not only as useless from the point of view of real preparedness, but as a danger to the peace and the democratic institutions of this country.

From the militaristic belief that war is a good thing and is inevitable you get the familiar Bernhardt logical argument. The steps of this chain are (1) since war is inevitable, we must prepare for it; (2) our preparation must be adequate or it is useless; (3) the best defense consists in an attack when your prospective enemy is not so well prepared as you are; (4) it is the duty of a country to declare war at the most favorable opportunity.

Bismarck in his "Reflections and Reminiscences," Chapter XXII, tells us definitely how the Prussian militarists tried to push him into war, how he used this militarist pressure to throw the country into war with Austria in 1866 and with France in 1870, and how he had to resist the powerful militarist pressure toward war in 1867, in 1875 and on other occasions. Bismarck says on page 102, Volume II:

"It is natural that in the staff of the army not only younger active officers, but likewise experienced strategists, should feel the need of turning to account the efficiency of the troops led by them, and their own capacity to lead, and of making them prominent in history. It would be a matter of regret if this effect of the military spirit did not exist in the army; the task of keeping its results within such limits as the nations' need of peace can justly claim is the duty of the political, not the military, heads of the state.

"That at the time of Luxemburg question, during the crisis of 1875, invented by Gortchakoff and France, and even down to the most recent times, the staff and its leaders have allowed themselves to be led astray and to endanger peace, lies in the very spirit of the institution."

The experience of the past year has shown that victory in modern wars is chiefly a matter of ammunition, and I should favor the storing up of millions of rifles, other munitions and supplies instead of the useless and dangerous measures proposed in these resolutions.

DR. HUGH CABOT

Military training, or training leading toward military efficiency, is at once not only preparation for defense or fighting, but, and far more important, an equipment for the business of living.

We concern ourselves with the training of mind but concern ourselves very little with the training of body, and with the relation between mind and body, called discipline.

As civilization tends to draw people together in large sections, the ability to look after one's self, and all that goes with it, is more and more neglected. It is certainly true that men of two generations ago were better able to look after themselves than the men of today.

Men should not fear unknown conditions because they are unknown. I think one sees it strikingly that the city-bred man is afraid of unknown situations.

Teaching boys things they ought to know is not conscription: it is education: part of the business of a democracy.

This military training should be begun in the school. At the age of ten boys should be taken out in the open and taught to look after themselves. If it is undesirable to take time from the curriculum, there is plenty of time in the summer vacations. It will be a thing that will pay perfectly sound dividends in the health of the community and in discipline. I think it is generally admitted to be strikingly true in our educational system that we do not introduce much discipline. There is more discipline in athletic crews and teams than in the educational system. They learn, in athletics, the discipline of obedience, that they have got to do certain things if the game is to go on.

The tendency of our civilization is to gather people together in a big city and take away from them the good that country living has developed. We should provide against this by a system of military training under the control of the State or national government.

DR. DUDLEY A. SARGENT

Let us consider first what are the fundamental requirements of modern war as regards the men and women of a belligerent country:

(a) Health and vigor of its people, and the knowledge of how to maintain it under both favorable and adverse circumstances.

(b) Mental acumen and bodily and mental control under trying circumstances.

(c) A courageous and generous spirit that will fight for what it believes is right for all it is worth.

The musket is a one-sided implement, too heavy for young boys and inefficient and harmful for older boys.

Recruits of eighteen show physical immaturity which results only too frequently in their ending in the hospital or being discharged as invalids. Recruits of eighteen require two years' special training before they are fit for military training.

The most military nations in the world do not have military drill in their schools, but give military instructions and training only after the boys have reached eighteen or twenty years, and have received years of physical training as a part of their schooling.

A rational system of physical training in the schools and colleges would be of the greatest value in preparing the youth of the country—both boys and girls—for the struggles of both war and peace.

Q. Are you familiar with the West Point military calisthenics? A. Yes.

Q. Do you think that is a good form of exercise to have in the schools, without any guns or weapons? A. Excellent. And it has become more excellent since Captain Koehler enlarged upon it.

Q. Speaking practically of our general schools, how much time would be healthful and practical to be allowed physical exercises? A. Half an hour a day at least.

Q. Consecutively? A. Better consecutively.

Q. In the open air? A. Yes, if you can.

Q. If we should have half an hour carefully arranged according to the best possible plan, would that be quite sufficient to develop our boys? A. Yes, it would be surprising to find how much you would get.

MISS A. E. ESILMAN

We have the unenviable reputation of being the most criminal nation. I think that I have a way to give us the lead in righteousness as well as to insure continual peace.

This country has had a full fling of self-governed youth, with the result that 4,867 young men, from 15 to 25 years old, were imprisoned in 1913 in the State of Massachusetts alone. One thousand eight hundred and thirty-three of them were under 21 years of age, and 175 of these were in for drunkenness.

Penal institutions cost this State over one and two-third millions net in 1913.

You have had the idea advanced here that military training is bad because it requires implicit, immediate obedience. These statistics are of boys who would not obey.

An idle mind is the evil one's workshop.

One reason for recommending military education for boys is because a boy's ideal is a manly man—and soldiers are always men, usually attractive and finely set up as a result of the training.

The idea of compulsory military service is not new. It dates back to 1785 when all able-bodied men in the country were enrolled in the Militia which was to be part of the army. Quite a few things are already compulsory—jury duty, school attendance, taxes, vaccination, and compliance with the Board of Health rules.

You have armories lying idle four or more nights a week—town halls usually idle at night—school halls seldom used. Why not put them to use? A place where big boys could learn men's work.

Substitute manly occupations which are helpful and entertaining for street attractions and penal institutions. A soldier is a respected man among his fellows because he represents authority and power—just what every boy is looking for. Put that power within his reach along educational lines, with good times, and you'll have no more difficulty.



The Federal Government should furnish expensive equipment, artillery, aeroplanes, and motor vehicles. A goodly number of lads are sure to find the key to success within those armories—poor, effeminate mothers' darlings as well as those who never saw much wholesome training before.

To make military service voluntary is to invite men to offer themselves as a sacrifice for their more selfish fellows who stay at home and make the necessities of the times their season of profit. If all this stir about preparedness is only to get volunteer enlistments I shall be disappointed. No man should be solicited, no matter how indirectly, to assume such a risk, while others equally able refuse to do their part. The whole proposition is contemptible and men are beginning to realize it.

Wars, riots, and strikes are rich men's quarrels usually. They would be far less frequent if their own heirs had to face the enemy or mob. None should be excused who are able to serve, the rich least of all for they have most at stake. The army surgeon should be the judge of their condition.

Voluntary enlistment would never give us enough to insure peace without worry.

If we train all our boys, in case of actual war only men between 21 and 30 need ever serve, for that would give us an army of over 10 millions.

Gentlemen: You are entrusted with the consideration of a plan for public defense. Earnestly I entreat you to consider the boys as future citizens and soldiers, and to make a plan that even our poorer communities can follow and the United States Government copy—something simple, strong and practical, that will be permanent, to make "A citizenry trained and accustomed to arms," as President Wilson expressed it.

HERBERT F. HARTWELL, CAPTAIN HEADQUARTERS STAFF,  
2D REGIMENT, M.V.M.

Again, if I have read the signs aright, among schoolmen there is little support, some passive receptivity and considerable active opposition to the idea of military drill in the schools, and I consider that they have some good reasons for their opinions. My own experiences as a high school cadet in Massachusetts for four years may not have any value for, or bearing on, the new idea of military training, so I will merely say that my subsequent experience as a national guardsman has taught me that, aside from how to march and to handle the rifle, it was of no practical value.

There are, I think, certain elements of military training, or certain branches of the soldier's profession that could with great value be introduced into high school work. For example, wireless, wig-wag, and other signal methods, with the necessary learning of the Morse code, field sanitation and personal hygiene, the mathematics of engineer and artillery problems, and the manipulation of engineer, signal and artillery corps instruments. Moreover, since the bulk of a field army is composed of infantry, install rifle ranges, issue a

certain number of rounds of .22 caliber ammunition to each boy, and give him instruction in shooting. Instruction in the use and caution against the misuse of firearms is vital to every community.

There is a certain definiteness of achievement in military matters which does not of necessity have to be put to the blood test to show efficiency. To secure that which we need is not a certain amount of training in the high school of an hour or so a week of perfunctory work, but a "round up" of all young men of, say, 18 years of age and physically fit, in a camp for drill and instruction for the period of a month in the summer for intensive drill eight hours a day. By so doing we will have the malingerer where he will be under discipline, the law will play no favorites, and those in charge will be answerable to their fellow citizens, to their wives and their children for an efficient protective force in time of the nation's greatest need.